



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Unquestionably, whatever amendments it may be possible to introduce into the Covenant in the immediate future, and it must be admitted that experience alone can dictate the eventual and definite form which a really authoritative and universally acceptable society of nations will assume, it will scarcely be denied that the principle of popular representation in the Assembly of the League must necessarily be conceded. Meanwhile, what body can more reasonably claim to supply that admitted deficiency than the Union, voicing, as it does, the concerted opinion of parliaments? The Inter-Parliamentary Union has a great rôle indicated to it as the friendly commentator and councillor of the Assembly of the League of Nations, and its considered resolutions cannot be lightly regarded.

I think I have in my general observations covered most of the ground comprised in my resolution, and I have reserved almost to the last reference to the important subject of the admission or adhesion to the League of those States which are not yet members of it.

First and foremost, I think it will be generally recognized that the continued exclusion of Germany is inadmissible. I must be excused if I refrain from a lengthy examination of this question, for I am most anxious to avoid any occasion for recriminatory discussion, and I will confine myself to the simple proposition that 60 million highly educated and gifted people, in the heart of Europe, cannot be permanently or even temporarily forbidden co-operation in the League of Nations, if that League is ever to achieve a position of recognized authority and confidence. In such a great and solemn undertaking, only the complete and cordial support of every race can confidently aspire to success. Little as well as great nations must be invited to join, and the new states recently brought into existence must be welcomed in its ranks.

For how grave is the responsibility of the civilized world if this great venture, this courageous effort to avert the horrors of war, were to fail! Can we forget the millions of dead—young men in the prime of life—the even greater number of maimed and permanently disabled, the immeasurable suffering, mourning and devastation, the wasted wealth, the dreadful hatreds, the consequences of the late war? Shall all that cruel experience avail us nothing? Is there any sacrifice, any exertion, which mankind should refuse to make to render forever impossible a repetition of these indescribable miseries?

It is in the contemplation of these terrible recollections that I venture to make an earnest appeal to our friends, the United States of America. I respect their doubts and hesitations. In some measure, at least, I have expressed my acquiescence in them; but can they remain altogether deaf to this appeal from a stricken world? It is true that they inhabit a different hemisphere, that our differences are generally no immediate concern of theirs, and that they cannot accept, without great reservations and safeguards, to share our responsibilities. But, while making free admission of these premises, I may remind them that they are, nevertheless, members—and most important ones—of the great human family; and how well they have shown in one direction their recognition of that fact in the magnificent generosity they have displayed in every field of

philanthropic activity. They have rescued, by their timely assistance, countless human lives, and they have rushed to the relief of distress in the famine districts of central and eastern Europe. Will they now refuse us the greatest service of all, to take a hand—and how powerful a one we know it would be—in the establishment of a world-wide organization for the maintenance of peace?

This Conference will not, perhaps, furnish us with a complete answer; but I cannot but hope that through its discussion, in which, happily, distinguished Americans will take part, much may be done to clear the air, to dissipate misconceptions, and thus facilitate the reconsideration of this matter by the people of the United States. Having a lifelong and familiar acquaintance with them, I well know how responsive they are to every noble purpose which their reasoned intelligence approves, and I am therefore sanguine enough to entertain confident expectations of their ultimate participation.

I will not enter into a particular examination of the provisions of the Covenant. They will form the main subject of our discussion, but I may formulate an anxious hope that the Conference will arrive at a substantial agreement as to the modifications which may appear desirable and will accept in its broad outline the resolution which I now have the honor to propose.

WAR BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN IMPOSSIBLE

By BARON SAKATANI

There must be read into this paper the more recent progress made toward settlement of the Yap dispute; but, in general, Baron Sakatani, we believe, has given the viewpoint of active and influential Japanese champions of peaceful relations between the two countries.—THE EDITORS.

IN DISCUSSING American-Japanese relations, the following questions are frequently cited as potential causes of war between the two countries: (1) Japanese immigration question; (2) the Yap mandate and the cable question; (3) the Korean question; (4) Chinese issues; and (5) Siberia. I have examined these questions and I cannot believe that they constitute any serious reason for supposing that Japan and the United States will ever go to war.

As to immigration, the fundamental views maintained by the Japanese and the American Governments seem to be identical. The American Government wishes no new immigrants, and, on the other hand, the Japanese Government does not wish to send more, determined to observe the gentleman's agreement. A thorough understanding has, therefore, been reached between the two countries. Americans do not like Japanese immigrants because the Japanese are diligent in work and socially clannish, not easily assimilable, and not that they despise the Japanese as an inferior race. Disputes arise out of matters affecting economic as well as social life, and there is some race prejudice.

FREE IMMIGRATION IN THEORY

Needless to say, Japanese seek free immigration, not only in America, but in the world. However, this is not

a political practice, but a theory, to be decided by the concerted efforts of the intellectual classes of Japan, America, and the world.

The total number of Japanese immigrants now in America is reported to be approximately 80,000, a majority of whom are living in California and other States of the Pacific coast, where anti-Japanese agitation is locally rampant. But we must note that the American Government is opposing anti-Japanese measures and engaged assiduously in preventing anti-Japanism. Although it cannot be denied that most of the States of the United States other than California are more or less influenced by those anti-Japanese agitations, we may safely say that the existence of so small a number of immigrants in America is regarded as unimportant from the practical point of view and would never cause a resort to arms.

Impartially speaking, the United States has no necessity to discriminate against a small number of Japanese immigrants, and we can have full confidence that the American Government will wisely dispose of the question.

YAP AND KOREA

As for Yap, what sane person can conceive that a small piece of volcanic rock in the Pacific should be the cause of a Japanese-American war? With regard to the mandate, the claim of Japan is clearly stated in the notes exchanged between the two governments, and the present situation of the question is that we are waiting to know whether the United States will acknowledge the Japanese claims or, failing that, what will be the basis of their claims. It is beyond doubt that an amicable settlement will be reached by the candid exchange of opinions.

The Korean question dates from the spring of 1919, when American missionaries, together with malcontent Koreans, charged the Japanese Government with cruelty and ruthlessness in quelling the disturbances. Their inflammatory propaganda gave rise to heated contentions against the Japanese Government among the Americans. But the question of Korea is purely Japanese, with which no other nation is entitled to interfere. Since the insurrections in 1919 efforts have been made to reform the administration of Korea, and at present our Korean policy is approved by most of the considerate Americans. In view of those facts, we cannot conceive that Korea will be the cause of an American-Japanese war.

QUESTIONS ABOUT CHINA

On questions affecting China, both the Japanese and the United States Governments have repeatedly exchanged views, and more than once their proclamations have been published. We may say that both nations have a thorough understanding. The Chinese Government never opposed the Japanese Government until the close of the World War, but at the end of the World War she altered her attitude toward Japan, and now she seems to be trying to approach the United States. The sudden change of China's attitude is due to her discontent with the Sino-Japanese treaties affecting Shantung and other questions. This is a point of special importance, in consideration of the estrangement of Japan and America. The question of rights and interests in

China is liable to give rise to international problems. It is to the credit of the American Government that it took the lead in organizing the new consortium. As to Shantung, it is far from being a possible cause of conflict between Japan and the United States, as it is clear that the Japanese Government is ready to return the former German lease to China. Only one point seems to preclude an amicable settlement, and that is the form by which the lease shall be surrendered. On this point the Chinese Government has protested against the Japanese claims during the peace negotiations at Versailles; but I believe the question as to the form of return is of no importance, since it is clear that Japan will return Shantung to China, and that is the main thing.

NO MORE FEAR OF EUROPE

The Japanese Government will maintain the open door in China and endeavor to preserve the security of Chinese territories. The Japanese used to have a jealous apprehension of the partition of China and the exclusive policy in China of the European powers, but since the close of the World War this fear of European aggression has been effaced from the Japanese mind. The China policy of Japan will have nothing against the Eastern policy of the United States, so far as the United States fosters no ambitious plan to invade China or establish coaling stations on the coast of China, but purposes, in co-operation with other powers, to encourage the improvement of the international administration of China and develop trade and industries.

The proposed revision of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance may be a cause of annoyance among some Chinese and Americans, but there is no need to fear the treaty. The principal purpose of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance has disappeared, as the result of the defeat of Germany and the downfall of Russia, and the revision of the pact will confine the treaty to consolidation of the moral bonds between Japan and Britain. It is of no importance whether the provisions pertaining to China, which are so resented by the Chinese, are continued or omitted from the treaty; also, it is obvious that the treaty does not aim at the United States.

The relation of China to Tibet or the relation between China and Russia may be pregnant with future issues, but on those points I cannot imagine that we shall have any difference with the United States.

THE REMEDY FOR CHINA

All the complex questions affecting China are due to the lack of a trustworthy central government and the economic and military weakness of the Chinese, which results in constant disturbance, lack of obedience on the part of the provincial armies, and no reliable policy for the affairs both of internal and international. The only remedy for these evils lies in a thorough understanding among other powers and their disinterested co-operation for the welfare of China. China can only be rescued by reform of her internal administration and the adjustment of her financial and police system in such a way as to preserve the honor of the Chinese and to place them under the international guidance as naturally as can be. I cannot find any reason why Japan and the United States should be opposed regarding such a policy toward China.

THE ROOT OF THE MATTER

The truth is that the Americans suspect the aggressive policy of Japan, while the Japanese harbor the same suspicion against the Americans. Such suspicion ends in mutual fear and misapprehension of each other, but I cannot realize how this fear could be cleared away by war between the two nations. It must be noticed there are some Americans who would repudiate established facts, thereby aggravating the Chinese question, as such methods would aggravate international problems. I hope the United States Government will not listen to the perverted thinking of those groups.

The most important issues connected with Siberia are the Japanese co-operative expedition for the sake of Czechoslovaks and the control of railways, neither or both of which, to my thinking, can give rise to war between Japan and America, especially as the Japanese Government is assiduously engaged in the final solution of the question of the Japanese expedition to Siberia and an amicable settlement is about to be reached on the question of railway control. Some trouble may arise between Japan and the United States in connection with the negotiations between Japan and Russia, which will be entered upon in the near future, as to the Nikolaievsk accident, but even on this point, so far as the solution does not encroach upon the interests of the United States, it will not constitute any cause of war.

JAPANESE EMIGRATION TO SIBERIA

The point of the Siberian questions pending between Japan and the United States lies in the restoration of the railway traffic between Paris and Vladivostok, as well as telegraphic communication through Siberia. The cessation of the traffic through Siberia is more acutely felt by Japan than the United States, and both will profit by the recovery of those conveniences. Added to this, certain fundamental ideas relating to the future of Siberia are shared by both Japanese and American politicians. It is the professed opinion of many influential American politicians that Japan should have a free hand in the development of Siberia, on the ground that, while the Russians have contributed nothing to the welfare of the world by their occupation of Siberia during past centuries, Japan should have an outlet for her surplus population. They say that it is irrational and dangerous to check the inflow of Japanese immigrants into the United States without giving her the means of disposing of her overpopulation. And as for the Japanese Government, the fundamental intention is to establish a buffer State, where her nation can enjoy freedom of emigration and trade and industry under the open door and equal-opportunity principles.

Russia groaned under the burden of maintaining enormous garrisons in Siberia under the former régime, and it is only natural of Japanese politicians to formulate such plans as will establish self-government with the prospect of future prosperity in Siberia without incurring the heavy cost incurred by Russia.

RUSSIAN AND GERMAN AGGRESSION

The history of the past two centuries clearly shows aggression toward the east by Germany and Russia,

especially the latter, which, taking advantage of the weakness of China, after annexing Siberia to Vladivostok, occupied Sakhalin and the island of Tsushima. It was only by the friendly aid of Great Britain that we ousted the Russians from Tsushima, and they then fell upon Manchuria and Korea, secured the lease of Port Arthur, and threatened to incorporate Korea. In the meantime Germany occupied Tsingtao, which they fortified to the menace of the integrity of the Far East. Fortunately, those two aggressive nations have lost prestige in the East during the great war; yet even at present incontestable evidences indicate their advocacy of the so-called Eastern policy. This is why it is the earnest desire of Japanese politicians to establish a buffer State in the Far East.

American-Japanese friendship is historical, and although at present there is no formal alliance between the two nations, the cordial assistance extended by the United States for the progress of civilization in Japan since the opening of our country sixty years ago is highly appreciated by the Japanese people, who regard the United States as their teacher in international affairs and sincerely respect the claims of the Americans on every occasion. Whenever some trouble took place between the two nations, it was always the sincere desire of the Japanese to reach a rational and amicable settlement on the basis of the maintenance of peace, and the most influential circles of both countries have always tried to prevent misunderstandings by keeping close contact with each other.

THE ARMAMENTS RACE

It is incomprehensible that journals and public speakers in both Japan and the United States are predicting the imminent danger of war to the unrest and agitation of the public in general. At the same time both governments are spending tremendous sums of money in manufacturing big guns and superdreadnaughts and fortifying small islands in the Pacific. What is the true intention of those formidable armaments? A dramatic engagement on the Pacific of two powerful navies would be a sensational event for the strategists of both countries, but what will be the pains and burdens of the peoples of Japan and the United States if they enter on naval rivalry? If the two nations ever take up arms against each other, nothing will result except the years of unbearable pain and the economic ruin of both nations. Who can conceive that the Japanese army would land at San Francisco and march to New York and Washington, or that the Americans, with their formidable armaments and their endless resources, would annihilate the Japanese people, even after a century of incessant effort?

Taking these facts into consideration, I hold there is no question pending between Japan and the United States which is impossible of peaceful solution. It is only the infernal influence of rumors which distort apparent facts and would rush both nations into preparation for fantastic war. I trust that the people of Japan and the United States will arouse themselves to urge their governments not to prosecute such absurd and dangerous policies.